

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant originally submitted Claims 1-20 in the application. The Examiner has indicated that Claims 16-20 are allowed and that Claims 2-4, 7-9 and 12-14 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form. In response, the Applicant has amended Claims 11-15. The Applicant believes that all of the pending claims are allowable and has not amended, canceled or added any other claims. Accordingly, Claims 1-20 are currently pending in the application.

I. Formal Matters and Objections

The Examiner has objected to an informality on page 1, line 21. More specifically, the Examiner has objected to the use of "was" in the phrase "sites was channeled back" and has suggested replacing "was" with "were." The Applicant respectfully disagrees since the entire sentence reads: "All access from remote sites was channeled back to a central location where a mainframe computer resided." Thus, the verb "was" is for "all access" which is singular and not for plural "sites" of the prepositional phrase "from remote sites. Accordingly, the Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw this objection.

The Examiner has also objected to the spacing on some of the pages of the specification. In response, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this objection since the spacing on the noted pages is used to distinguish between sections and will not be evident when the application is published.

II. Rejection of Claims 1, 5-6, 10-11 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 5-6, 10-11 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,857,005 to Buckenmaier. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Buckenmaier is directed to ensuring the existence of valid data in systems controlled by multiple clock sources. (*See* column 1, lines 9-11.) Buckenmaier teaches a synchronizing circuit 200 having first and second memory cells 212, 214, that operate on clock inputs from two independent clock domains (input clock and output clock). The synchronizing circuit 200 also includes a data transfer controlling means 226 that controls transfer of data from the first memory cell 212 to the second memory cell 214. (*See* column 3, line 21 to column 4, line 17 and Figure 2.) The data transfer controlling means 226 includes a positive edge detection circuit 228 that is driven by the output clock signal. (*See* column 5, lines 56-59 and Figure 2.)

Buckenmaier does not teach, however, synchronizing an event signal from a first clock zone device to a second clock rate based upon an edge transition of the event signal and the second clock rate, and generate a synchronous notification signal therefrom as recited in Claims 1, 6 and 11. Instead, the positive edge detection circuit 228 produces a pulse that is employed to transfer data from the first memory cell 212 to the second memory cell 214 based on receipt of an output from a delay circuit 216 and a clock pulse of the output clock signal. (*See* column 5, line 66 to column 6, line 18 and Figure 2.) Thus, the positive edge detection circuit 228 controls data transfer from the memory cell 212 driven by the input clock signal to the memory cell 214 driven by the output clock signal based on an output of the delay circuit 216 and the output clock signal. This differs from synchronizing an event signal based on upon an edge transition of the event signal and a second clock rate as recited in Claims 1, 6 and 11.

Therefore, Buckenmaier does not disclose each and every element of independent Claims 1, 6 and 11 and Claims dependent thereon. Accordingly, Buckenmaier does not anticipate Claims 1, 5-6, 10-11, and 15. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the §102(a) rejection with respect to these Claims 1, 5-6, 10-11, and 15 and allow issuance thereof.

III. Comment Regarding Double Patenting

The Examiner has commented that should Claims 1-5 be found allowable, that Claims 11-15 would be objected to under 35 C.F.R. as being a substantial duplicate. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the comment and has amended Claims 11-15 to more clearly claim the intended subject matter.

IV. Comment Cited References

The Applicant reserves further review of the references cited but not relied upon if relied upon in the future.


V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicant now sees all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicits a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-20.

The Applicant requests the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, P.C.


J. Joel Justiss
Registration No. 48,981

Dated: 9/22/04

P.O. Box 832570
Richardson, Texas 75083
(972) 480-8800